REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 12-21 are pending in this application, with claims 12, 15, and 20 being the only independent claims. Claims 1-11 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 12-16 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,277,453 (Chin) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,016,512 (Huitema) and in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0218611 (Kim).

Claims 17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Chin, Huitema, and Kim, and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0133775 (Callas).

Claims 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over as unpatentable over Chin, Huitema, and Kim, and further in view of WO 2005/069663 (Laurila).

Before discussing the cited prior art and the Examiner's rejections of the claims in view of that art, a brief description of the subject matter described in the present application is deemed appropriate to facilitate understanding of the arguments for patentability. The description is not meant to argue unclaimed subject matter.

The present invention relates to a method, a system, and a name server for the transmission of communications from a first data transmission network to a second receiving data transmission network. According to an embodiment of the present invention, the first network has a control element S and a local name server D (see Fig. 1 and page 5, lines 10-26). The second network has a contact point I that functions as an access point to the second network (see page 5, lines 5-8) and a name server PD which stores network addresses of the internal elements of the operator network (see page 5, lines 29-32).

According to an embodiment of the present invention, when a subscriber of the first network sends a SIP INVITE message to a subscriber of the second network the control element S queries

the local name server D of the first network and the local name server of the first network in turn queries the private name server PD of the second network for the address of the contact point I of the second network (see page 6, lines 10-18). After receiving the address from the private name server, the local name server D forwards the information to the control element S which then transmits the communication to the contact point I of the second network (page 6, lines 18-21). The contact point I operates as an access point to the second network and routes the communication to the intended subscriber. Accordingly, the local name server D of the first network is required to store only the network address of the private name server PD of the second network.

Independent claim 12 recites "the first operator network comprising a first name server and the second operator network comprising a second name server and the required access point for receiving communication from at least the first operator network" and "transmitting the query from the first name server to the second name server of the second operator network, the second name server comprising network addresses of access points of the second operator network".

The Examiner's proffered combination of Chin, Huitema, and Kim fails to teach or suggest the above limitations because Huitema, which the examiner considers as teaching the above-cited step of transmitting, fails to disclose a name server of one network transmitting a query to a name server of another network, as will be described in more detail below.

Chin discloses inter private network communications in which a host in one private network accesses another host in another private network via a public network (See Figs. 1 and 2 of Chin). Chin teaches that a gateway 310 is arranged between each private network and the public network (see col. 7, lines 58-65; and Fig. 3 of Chin). The gateway 310 includes a relay 320 that accepts packets from the private network and send them to a destination or accepts incoming packets from the public network and directs them to a host in the private network (see col. 8, lines 3-13 of Chin).

As acknowledged in the office action, Chin fails to disclose "transmitting the query from the first name server to the second name server of the second operator network, the second name server comprising network addresses of access points of the second operator network", as recited in independent claim 12.

The Examiner relies on the teachings of Huitema in combination with Chin to disclose that limitation. However Huitema also fails to disclose that limitation because Huitema relates to operations between servers within a single network.

Huitema relates to processing domain name (DN) queries in a network. According to Huitema, a network 300 includes a local computer 110 coupled to a local cache server 310. A cache server 340 and root server 130 are connected to the local cache server 310 (see col. 3, lines 20-22 of Huitema). The local cache server 310 includes a most frequently used domain name (MFU DN) table 320 and a validity code table 330 (col. 3, lines 23-25 of Huitema). When a user types a request, the local cache server 310 accesses the MFU DN table 320 stored therein (see col. 5, lines 25-35 of Huitema). If the request is not found, the local cache server 310 determines whether the DN is valid using the validity code table 330 (col. 5, lines 35-47 of Huitema).

Since Huitema discloses only querying a server within the same network and not the server of another network, the combination of Huitema and Chin results in each network of Chin having the local cache server 310 disclosed by Huitema. Accordingly, the combination of Chin and Huitema fails to disclose "transmitting the query from the first name server to the second name server of the second operator network, the second name server comprising network addresses of access points of the second operator network", as expressly recited in independent claim 12.

Kim fails to disclose what Chin and Huitema lack. Kim discloses a gateway for supporting communications devices in different networks. According to Kim, a DNS server 330

is connected to the Internet between Gateways to two different private networks. Accordingly, Kim also fails to disclose "transmitting the query from the first name server to the second name server of the second operator network, the second name server comprising network addresses of access points of the second operator network", as expressly recited in independent claim 12.

The additional references of Callas and Laurila, cited by the Examiner in the rejections of dependent claims 17-19 and 21, also fail to disclose the recited limitations. Callas merely discloses that a mail server can be a LDAP server and Laurial discloses monitoring session content and signalling information in an IMF network. However, Callas and Laurila fail to disclose, teach or suggest anything about a name server being queried for a network address of a network access point.

In view of the above remarks, independent claim 12 is allowable over the combination of Chin, Huiteama, Kim, Callas and Laurila.

Independent claims 15 and 20 are directed to a method and a name server, respectively, and include limitations similar to the above limitations of independent claim 12. Accordingly, independent claims 15 and 20 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as is independent claim 12.

Dependent claims 13-14, 16-19, and 21 are allowable for the same reasons as are independent claims 12, 15, and 20, as well as for the additional recitations contained therein.

The application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance, and early notice to that effect is solicited.

Should the Examiner have any remaining comments, questions, suggestions, or objections, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned in order to resolve any outstanding issues.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any additional fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By /Alfred W. Froebrich/
Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: December 3, 2010